DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 074 IR 008 555

AUTHOR Hannaford, W. E., Jr.
TITLE Collection Development in Ten Small Academic Libraries: A Report to the Council on Library Resources.
INSTITUTION Middlebury Coll., Vt.
SPONS AGENCY Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries: *Books: College Libraries: Higher Education: *Library Acquisition: *Library Collections: Library Material Selection: Library Surveys: Private Colleges: Small Colleges

ABSTRACT

This investigation of how ten small, private college libraries go about collecting books focuses on the degree of responsibility and control those libraries exercise over what is included in their collections. The findings and conclusions of the study are based upon interviews with library administrators and acquisitions librarians at Middlebury College, Bowdoin, Colby, Bates, Wellesley, Amherst, Trinity, Hamilton, Union, and Colgate. These colleges were chosen because of their similarities of purpose, staff size, student enrollment, faculty, number of library volumes added annually, library budgets, and library holdings. Chapters identify the objectives of the study, the methodology used, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Appendices include the application for a fellowship to conduct the study, the collection development questionnaire, and the tabulated answers. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190074

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IN TEN SMALL ACADEMIC LIBRARIES:

A REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES

W. E. Hannaford, Jr.
Middlebury College Library

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William E. Hannaford, jr

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008555

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Objectives

III. Methodology

IV. Findings

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

Appendix I Application for Fellowship

Appendix II Collection Development Questionnaire with Tabulated Answers

INTRODUCTION

In his essay "What's Wrong with Librarians?" Lawrence Clark Powell rails against those in libraries who have little or no feel or feelings for books.

> In my fight against non-bookism in library work and with un-social scientists, I have rallied many librarians and laymen to the cause, in a revival of reading. Sick of jargon, and of surveys which spin out what we already know, of so-called human engineering and the decision-making process, of the flight into techniques of those unbelievers who will do everything to a book but read it, these lonely librarians and readers have rallied to the old-fashioned gospel that books are basic, books are best, books are to be read and shared, world without end.[1]

Some may think that the above passage expresses an out-of-date view; others, that it is not extreme enough. As is often the case, the truth probably lies somewhere in-between.

While the battle which Powell waged against non-bookism is still being fought, many small academic libraries have been and remain largely committed to the book, though information in other formats is and should be making inroads.

This study is primarily an investigation of how ten small, private, academic libraries go about collecting books. By "books" I mean to include any information in a printed format. It is refreshing to note that the book is alive and well in all of the

ten academic libraries studies, and yet at the same time that most of them have made some committment to non-print material where it is appropriate.

I am grateful for the fellowship awarded me by the Council on Library Resources which allowed me to personally visit the libraries of nine colleges - Bowdoin, Bates, Colby, Amherst, Wellesley, Trinity, Union, Hamilton and Colgate. Not only was I able to compare each of the libraries against the other, but also against my home library, Middlebury College Library, which is included in the study. I would only hope that this final report proves a fraction as interesting and useful to the libraries I visited as my visits to them did to me, and that this is not a survey spinning out what we already know.

In this report, the practices of each library are discussed, but not by name. This is to protect both the innocent and the guilty.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

As mentioned in the original application for the fellowship (See Appendix I), very little regarding collection development in small academic libraries has appeared in the library literature. Large academic and research libraries have received most of the attention. Thus, the main objective of this study was to discover if anything in the way of collection development was going on in small academic libraries. In other words, how much responsibility and control do small academic libraries exercise over what is included in the library's collection.

Before going any further, it is important to get clear on just what collection development is. It might, first, be easier to say what it is not. It is not the selection or the acquisition of materials. Nor is it the weeding or evaluating of materials, nor even all of these together with a host of other activities. No library that I know of, and certainly none that I visited during the course of this study, fails to engage in most of the activities which, when properly placed together, go to make up collection development. That is, most libraries select and weed materials, evaluate their collections and request and allocate budgets. Many, though, do very little actual collection development. What is it, then, that constitutes collection development,

above and beyond the sum total of all of the activities which make it up?

Collection development can be defined as the intentional and systematic building of a library collection. There are, of course, certain constraints such as money, clientele, purpose, etc., within which activities such as selecting, weeding, budgeting and evaluating all become part of collection development. It is the activity of knowingly and purposefully building a library collection systematically, superimposed upon the other activities which go to make up collection development, that makes the former more than the sum total of the latter.

It becomes possible, then, under this definition of collection development, to select, weed, evaluate and budget, and yet do no collection development, just as it is possible to chip away at a piece of marble without actually sculpting a statue.

At this point, it might be interesting to ask how one guages whether a library is doing any collection development or not. Some of the tell-tale signs for doing collection development are the following:

1. written policies covering collection development activities,
2. control of and responsibility for the materials budget by the library,
3. presence of someone in the library who is, in effect, the chief collection development officer,
4. librarians who select, weed, evaluate, budget and allocate,

5. the presence of a collection development organization, e.g. faculty liaison.

There are, of course, other conditions, but these are sufficiently obvious to help make the point. For example, if a library allocates all or most of its materials budget to various departments, it becomes difficult to imagine how much collection development is occurring unless someone in the library is actually overseeing the whole activity. I do not mean to say that the library must generate all selections, just as the architect need not actually construct the building or the choreographer need not be a dancer. But the librarian, like the architect or choreographer, must be the designer, in this case, of the collection.[2]

METHODOLOGY

Simply put, the methodology of this study is that of personal interview, usually with the director of the library, but in a few cases with the associate/assistant director. In several instances, the acquisitions librarian was also interviewed.

Armed with a questionnaire (See Appendix II), I normally arrived at the library early in the morning and departed late in the afternoon. The answers did not always fit the neat pidgeonholes I would have them fit, but the questionnaire served its purpose as a catalyst for discussion quite well. Two copies of the questionnaire were used during each interview, one for the interviewer and one for the person being interviewed. The interviewer's copy was copiously annotated during the course of the interview, and the results are tallied in Appendix II. Supporting documentation, e.g. HEGIS reports, collection development policies, budget reports and the like were requested, but in several cases could not be supplied.

Listed below are the dates of the visits, the places visited, and the names and positions of persons interviewed:

Date	Places	Persons Interviewed
6/5	Bowdoin	Arthur Monke, Librarian Shirley Reuter, Acquisition Librarian
6/6	Colby	Stuart Debenham, Librarian

Date	Place	Persons Interviewed
6/7	Bates	Joseph Derbyshire, Librarian
6/12	Wellesley	Y. T. Feng, Librarian
6/13	Amherst	Willis Bridegam, Librarian
6/14	Trinity	Ralph Emerick, Librarian
6/18	Hamilton	Ralph Stenstrom, Librarian Keith Washburn, Assistant Librarian
6/19	Union	Jean Pelletier, Librarian Ruth Ann Evans, Associate Librarian Ann Seeman, Bibliographer
6/20	Colgate	Bruce Brown, Librarian Carolyn Dearnaley, Assistant Librarian

These colleges were chosen to be in the study because they are similar in purpose, number of librarians, student enrollment, FTE faculty, volumes added annually to the library and holdings and budgets of libraries. For this study, the single most important factor was that of materials budget and almost all of the libraries had budgets in the $200,000-$300,000 range. While there are certainly some interesting differences, these are far outweighed by their similarities, at least as far as this study is concerned.[3]

FINDINGS

The results of this study are tabulated in Appendix II. In this section of the report I will summarize briefly the important aspects of the findings following the same general breakdown used in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire itself was aimed at finding out if the libraries included in this study were doing any collection development. It was clear to me at the end of my site visits that a number of libraries were, in effect, doing little or no collection development. More will be said about this later.

ORGANIZATION

Two libraries have no chief collection development officer, i.e., no one who acts as the architect of the collection, no one who reviews and coordinates collection development activities. This is an indication, most likely, that the library staff merely processes orders given them by the faculty who in turn do all or most of the selection. Further, three of the libraries have no collection development organization whatsoever, and only half have a faculty liaison structure.

The overall collection development organizational picture, or lack of it, for several of the libraries visited appeared to function like the following. Faculty submit most of the selections

to the library where there is little or no review. The library orders the various materials, processes them when they come in, and puts them on the shelves. Other than acting as a processing medium, the librarians are minimally involved with the materials and have little or no say about which materials the library holds. Faculty members almost unilaterally and individually design the library's collection.

On the more positive side, it must be noted that a number of the libraries did have chief collection officers, did have some collection development organization, did have librarians who select materials, and did attempt to hire librarians who could select materials. Also, it should be mentioned that all of the librarians interviewed in this study had at least an awareness of and had thought about many of the issues involved in collection development organizational patterns.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT - GENERAL

Very few of the many records kept by these libraries are employed as an aid to collection development. Eight of the libraries use I.L.L. records, three circulation records, and one OCLC tapes. Several libraries use no records whatsoever. This seems to indicate that many of the libraries are still in the very early stages of using bibliographic information generated internally for use in collection development.

Ironically, most libraries indicated a need to identify and fill gaps in the collection while at the same time many know little

about how to do this and respond mainly to faculty requests.

Interestingly, the vast majority of librarians interviewed indicated that they thought that much of what was selected for the libraries in which they worked was little or never used. This perception might be caused by the frustration of knowing that in an undergraduate institution, too much of the collection development, selection in this case, was in the hands of the faculty.

SELECTION

Fewer than half of the libraries have written collection development policies, though several have plans to write them. Most selection is done on a title-by-title basis with many, if not most, of the selections coming from the faculty, at least at a number of the colleges. Most of the libraries have a librarian who reviews the majority of the selections before ordering. If a selection is deemed not appropriate to the collection, in most cases a process of negotiating takes place, though several librarians interviewed said that this rarely happens.

EVALUATION

Most of the libraries had evaluated their monographic collections with this usually happening at the point of reclassification from Dewey Decimal to Library of Congress. Half have evaluated their serial or periodical collections. Eight of the ten libraries have no written guidelines for evaluation. It appears that most of the evaluation has been done as a secondary concern, usually as part of

another project. Evaluation per se does not seem to be much of an issue, nor did anyone indicate that evaluation might lead to better and more focused selection.

WEEDING

As with evaluation, weeding seemed of little concern and was usually accomplished as part of another larger project. Again, few have written guidelines.

ALLOCATION

Another indication that the faculty are selecting a rather large percentage of all materials added to the collection is that the materials budget in nine of the ten libraries is allocated to departments. When a materials budget is allocated to a department, rather than by subject, this usually means that only members of a department are empowered to spend off the allocation. Another part of the materials budget, usually a small part and generally called "general," is then laid aside for librarians.

It was surprising to find that nine of the ten libraries had budgets considered adequate by the librarians interviewed, but not at all surprising to find that all of the libraries surveyed allocated their funds by a combined historical and percentage system.

The one area of concern to many libraries is the serials-monographs budget ratio. While most are presently where they think they should be, in the 40-60 to 50-50 range, several see a growing

problem as time goes on, i.e., the serials budget will begin to encroach upon the monographs.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Simply put, the conclusion of this study of ten small, academic libraries is that while some of the libraries have travelled some way down the path of collection development in its full blown sense, several of the libraries have not gone very far at all, and most need to do much more.

The main findings which bring me to the above conclusion are:

1. that several libraries have no chief collection development officer,
2. that several libraries have no collection development organization whatsoever and most have only a minimal formal one,
3. that most of the libraries do not have a serials review committee,
4. that internally generated bibliographic records are being only sparingly used for collection development,
5. that there are very few libraries with any written collection development policies,
6. that in several libraries no one reviews all selections,
7. that few of the libraries have evaluated or weeded their collections in a really systematic way,

8. that in most libraries the materials budget is allocated to departments rather than by subject,
9. that allocation of the materials budget is done by historical precedence and percentage.

These findings support, I think, the conclusion that a number of the libraries serve as processing agents for the faculty of the college who, by and large, do most of the selection. Further, very little evaluating, weeding or sophisticated allocating is being done. This, coupled with the fact that in a number of the libraries there is no architect of the collection, leads to the conclusion that collection development is still in its infancy in some of these small academic libraries. Put another way, since selecting, evaluating, weeding and allocating are not being carried out in an intentional and systematic fashion in a number of the libraries visited, the conclusion follows that collection development is simply not being done in them.

Lest this conclusion sound too harsh, let me soften it a bit. As I said earlier, all of the libraries visited are adding materials to their collections, most are certainly weeding an item now and again, most are making evaluative statements about their collections from time to time, and finally all are receiving funds to cover all of these activities. What is not being done that is collection development is to combine and carry out all of these activities in a systematic and intentional way under the guiding hand of a single individual.

As a way of clarifying the above, let me give an example. Libraries often build their collections almost in spite of themselves. The situation is analogous to a building designed and built by many individuals with no single person in charge. The building gets built, but it does not look like much and may not serve its inhabitants well.

How can the situation be improved? Let me be presumptuous enough to offer up a few recommendations[4], without going into them in any detail. This latter must be done at another time.

1. Assign one librarian to be the chief collection development officer. This position might best be assigned to an associate or assistant librarian, a college bibliographer or the acquisitions librarian, because of time constraints on the librarian.
2. Set up a formal faculty liaison structure to ensure reasonable faculty input into the collection development processes.
3. Have written collection development policies, one each for selection, evaluation, weeding and allocating, using the various guidelines developed by the Collection Development Committee[5]; then follow them.
4. Appoint a serials review committee to review all ongoing library committments, i.e., serials and continuations. This committee might be made up of the chief collection

development officer, the head of reference and another librarian to ensure several viewpoints.

5. Allocate materials budgets by subject rather than by department. This makes it clear to everyone whose budget it is and allows for selection by a larger number of individuals (both faculty and librarians) and for fewer gaps in the selection process, and therefore in the collection.
6. Begin to budget using modelling techniques already developed.

The above recommendations are meant to be suggestive of the way to good collection development, though they may only signal a beginning of a definitive model. More research obviously needs to be done in the area of collection development for college libraries. This study should be seen as an initial foray into this still largely uncharted area.

REFERENCES

1 Lawrence Clark Powell, Bookman's Progress (Los Angeles: Ward Ritchie Press, 1968), p. 89.

2 For a fuller discussion of this matter see William E. Hannaford, "Toward a Theory of Collection Development," in Collection Development (Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1980).

3 "Selected Library Statistics for 1978/79," compiled by Arthur Monke, Librarian of Bowdoin College.

4 For a discussion of and recommendations for collection development in college libraries see William Miller and D. Stephen Rockwood, "Collection Development from a College Perspective," College and Research Libraries, 40:318-324 (July 1979).

5 American Library Association, Resources and Technical Services Division, Collection Development Committee, Guidelines for Collection Development (Chicago: American Library Association, 1979).

APPENDIX I

APPLICATION FOR FELLOWSHIP

APPLICATION FOR ☐ GENERAL ☑ FOCUSED FELLOWSHIP (check one)

COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES

One Dupont Circle • Washington, D.C. • 20036 Tel 202-296-4757

Read the instruction sheet before filling out this form. *Applications that do not provide all requested information on the form itself will not be considered.* The original and seven (7) copies of the form and accompanying documents should be sent to the Fellowship Committee, Council on Library Resources, postmarked no later than November 1, 1978.

Name William E. Hannaford, Jr. Citizenship U.S. Date of Birth 08/15/40

Home Address Rt.1,Box 218, Shoreham, VT 05770 Tel. 802-897-2658
(Zip Code)

Place of Employment Starr Library, Middlebury College Supervisor Ronald Rucker

Address Middlebury, VT 05753 Tel. 802-388-7856
(Zip Code)

Title and Brief Description of Present Position Acquisitiions Librarian: Coordinate collection development activities-selection, evaluation,weeding and materials budget- and manage the Acquisitions and Serials Departments.

PROPOSED PROGRAM

1. Provide below a concise statement of proposed program. Amplify in a two- or three-page attachment.

Collection development in small academic libraries is an extremely significant activity that has been studied very little. This proposal is to study such activities at ten college libraries. Specifically,the methods employed to select, weed and evaluate the collections and to allocate the budgets in these libraries will be studied. The ten college libraries selected for the study are private, in close proximity to Middlebury College and have materials budgets in the $100,000 to $300,000 range. It is hoped that the study will bring to light patterns and trends of collection development useful to many other small academic libraries.

2. Tentative Budget (complete A or B):

A. Programs including travel:

Per diem 15 days at $40	$600
Travel (economy rate, or use of own car at 15 cents a mile)	$270
In-city transportation	
Supplies and materials	
Other (specify)	
TOTAL REQUESTED	$870

B. Project-connected costs for programs without travel:

In-city transportation	
Supplies and materials	
Other (specify)	
TOTAL REQUESTED	

3. If travel is contemplated, give below itinerary for each trip, number of days required, and method and cost of transportation to be used for each. Amplify, if necessary, on an attached sheet.

June 4-8: Bowdoin, Colby, Bates; private car; $200 per diem and $90 travel.
June 11-15: Amherst, Williams, Wellesley; private car; $200 per diem and $90 travel.
June 18-22: Union, Colgate, Hamilton; private car; $200 per diem and $90 travel.

Length of time your project requires three months

Estimate of continuous leave available, should you receive a Fellowship three months

What portion of your salary will you receive while on leave? unknown at this time

Specific dates you would intend to carry out the program. (Final report must be completed by September 30, 1980.)
June 1, 1979, through August 31, 1979

On a separate sheet list the learned, scientific, or professional societies of which you are a member; the grants or fellowships you have held or now hold; your principal publications, if any; awards received; languages spoken or read and degree of proficiency.

Have you applied or do you plan to apply at this time for any other fellowship or grant? no

If yes, please specify

POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL EDUCATION (institution, dates, degrees, studies or disciplines)

University of New Hampshire, 1964-1966, B.A., Philosophy

University of Colorado, 1966-1972, M.A., Ph.D., Philosophy

University of Illinois, 1974-1975, M.S., Library Science

EXPERIENCE, beginning with your present position and working backwards

Institution	Position Held	Dates	Salary
Middlebury College	Acquisitions Librarian	7/78-present	$13,500
University of New Mexico	Acting Assistant Dean for Collection Development	11/77-6/78	$16,500
University of New Mexico	Humanities Bibliographer and Deputy to Assistant Dean for Collection Development	8/75-10/77	
University of Illinois	Visiting Lecturer (Library Science)	6/77-8/77	$ 2,500
Illinois State University	Assistant Professor of Philosophy	6/70-6/73	$12,500

REFERENCES: List the names, positions, and addresses (including zip codes) of four persons to whom the Council may write for expert judgment concerning your abilities, especially in relation to your proposal for the use of a Fellowship. One of the four should be a person who is recognized as having special competence or expertise in your proposed project area. The Council reserves the right to make inquiries of other appropriate individuals, should it wish to do so.

Paul Mosher, Assistant Director, Stanford University Library, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California 94305

George Miller, Director of Library Communications, General Library, Universi of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131

Ronald Rucker, Librarian, Starr Library, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont 05753

Daniel Lester, Assistant Dean for Technical Services, General Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131

I understand the award is contingent on my having continuous leave from employment of at least three months for performance of the proposed project.

Date and place of mailing 10/27/78-Middlebury,VT Signature

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

American Philosophical Association
American Library Association

FELLOWSHIPS

NDEA Fellow (Colorado)
University Fellow (Colorado)
Teaching Associate (Colorado)
Graduate Assistantship (Illinois)

PUBLICATIONS

A Short Bibliography of Philosophy Books for Public Libraries. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico, 1978. ERIC Document.

Puppetry Library: A Bio-Bibliography with Annotations Based on the Batchelder McPharlin Collection of the University of New Mexico. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979. (with George Miller and Janet Harris.) (In progress.)

"Toward a Theory of Collection Development," in Collection Development. Edited by George Miller and Robert Stueart. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1979. (In Progress.)

"Library." The New Mexico Independent, 81 (May 1977), 3. (with Alan Reed.)

Introduction to Philosophy. New York: Van Nostrand, 1974. (with Gene Blocker.)

"Perspectives on Diffusion: Descriptive and Prescriptive." Social Science Education Consortium Newsletter, 16 (November 1973), 1-4.

AWARDS

Beta Phi Mu
Phi Kappa Phi

LANGUAGES

French - read, good
German - read, fair

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IN SMALL ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

There is much data available on collection development activities in large academic and research libraries but very little on smaller academic libraries. One need only look at the library literature for the last ten years to see that this is true. Small academic libraries fall into the category of having enough of a materials budget to enable large scale purchases but not enough to get everything. It is in just these situations that collection development is often most difficult. Further, since there is very little data on collection development in small academic libraries, those in charge of collection development have nowhere to turn for advice, consultation, or .....

Collection development as a total concept is relatively new. It has come to mean rather recently all of those activities which help to systematically mold and shape a library's collection. These varied activities can be put into four main groupings - selection, weeding, evaluation of collections and budgeting and allocation. The Collection Development Committee of RTSD is in the process of writing guidelines for each of the latter three areas. A guideline for selection, "Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies," has already been published. (LRTS, 21, 1977, 40-47.) The literature of collection development is growing quite rapidly, but, again, very little of it is germane to small academic libraries.

Most libraries have, of course, always selected materials to be added to the collection, weeded materials from the collection, taken stock of the collection and spent their monies. But these activities differ, sometimes radically, from collection development, which is

systematic and integrative. Many large research libraries have recently begun the long and arduous task of making collection development systematic, including the writing of collection development policies. Much of this will, in the future, filter through to smaller libraries.

This proposal is to study the entire range of collection development activities in small academic libraries. These are defined to be libraries in which the materials budget is between $100,000 and $300,000. What is to be studied are the methods employed by ten college libraries to select, weed, evaluate collections and budget and allocate. The libraries to be studied are: Bowdoin, Colby and Bates in Maine; Middlebury in Vermont; Amherst, Williams and Wellesley in Massachusetts; and Union, Colgate and Hamilton and Kirkland in New York. All are in close proximity to Middlebury and should require a minimum of travel.

Specifically, the study will include how and why each of the libraries selects, acquires and weeds as it does, who is responsible for these activities, whether these activities are covered by written policies, how and why the library receives its budget, how and why this budget is allocated within the library, and whether these activities are covered by policies. It is expected that most, if not all, of this information can be summarized in tabular form and spelled out in detail in written form. It is also expected that interesting comparative data will emerge and that these will lead to certain findings.

Travel to the nine libraries, other than Middlebury to be studied, should be feasible in a fifteen day period; the total mileage involved is approximately 1800 if these libraries are visited in groups according to state. If the data collection is accomplished in June, a three month period remains in which to write a report to the Council on Library Resources I would also expect the results of the study to be publishable.

APPENDIX II

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

WITH TABULATED ANSWERS

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

ORGANIZATION

1. Does the library have a chief collection development officer?[1]

   Yes - 8 No - 2

   If so, who?

   Librarian - 5

   Associate/Assistant Librarian - 1

   Acquisitions Librarian - 2

   What are his/her responsibilities?

   As far as selection is concerned, responsibilities ranged from reviewing all selections to reviewing only those costing above a certain amount of money or those continuing in nature to reviewing very little at all.

2. Who has the responsibility for selecting? Faculty, librarians, both?
   " evaluating? "
   " weeding? "
   " budgeting? "

	Faculty	Librarians	Both[2]
Selecting	1		9
Evaluating		3	7
Weeding		2	8
Budgeting[3]		10	

3. What formal/informal organization for collection development does the library have? E.g., faculty liaison, selection librarians, etc.?

None[4]	3
Faculty liaison	5
Selection librarians[5]	7

4. Does the library have a serials review committee?

Yes - 2 No[6] - 8

If so, what are its responsibilities?

The serials review committee is usually responsible for reviewing all the library's continuing obligations, i.e., serials and continuations.

5. Does the library make any effort to hire librarians with subject competence above and beyond librarianship?

Yes[7] - 7 No - 3

6. Is there anything in particular or in general about organization you would like to find out from a study such as this one?

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT - GENERAL

1. Is any use of circulation records, I.L.L. records, OCLC, etc., made in developing the collection? Is so, please describe.

Yes -	I.L.L. records	8
	Circulation records	3
	OCLC	1
No[8]		2

2. What are the most pressing collection development needs of the library at the present? E.g., identifying and filling in gaps, budget, selection, etc.?

Identifying and filling in gaps	8
Refining selection methods	2
Retrospective purchasing	1
Responding to requests for expensive items	1
Identifying the needs themselves	1
Having collection development controlled by librarians	1
Weeding	1
Holding too few serial titles	1

3. What factors are intentionally taken into account when developing the library's collection? E.g., curriculum, number of faculty, number of students, etc.?

Faculty requests	10
Curriculum	8
Bibliographies	2
Political pressure	2
Use	2
Building on strengths	1
Immediate needs	1
Collection weaknesses	1
Circulation figures	1
New faculty areas of expertise	1
Number of faculty	1
Number of students in various majors	1
Publishing record of faculty	1

4. Do you think that the Kent/Galvin hypothesis applies to this library? Why?

Yes[9]	9
No	0
Not sure	1

5. Do you think that the so-called "80-20" rule applies to this Library? Why?

Yes[10]	9
No	0
Not sure	1

6. What cooperative collection development arrangements does this library have with others?

None	5
Consortia	5

What arrangements would you like to see in the future?

Most expressed a desire to implement shared collection development responsibilities, but were not sure how to go about it.

7. Is there anything in particular or in general about collection development you would like to find out from a study such as this one?

SELECTION

1. Does the library have written collection development policies for selection?

   Yes - 4

   No - 6

   Are they presently being written?

   Yes - 2

   No - 4

   Are there plans to write them?

   Yes - 2

   No - 1

   What format is/was/will being used?

   RTSD Guidelines - 4

   Other - 1

2. How is selection actually done? E.g., title-by-title from reviewing tools, orders received from faculty, approval plans, standing order plans, other methods?

Orders received from faculty	10
Standing order plans	9
Title-by-title from reviewing tools	8
Blanket order plans	2
Approval plans	1

3. What reviewing tools, if any, are used for selection?

   Choice, Publishers' Weekly, New York Times, New York Review of Books, scholarly journals, Library Journal, Times Literary Supplement, publishers' flyers.

4. Does any one librarian review and approve all selections before they are ordered? Who?

Yes - 7	Librarian	3
	Associate/Assistant Librarian	2
	Acquisitions Librarian	2
No - 3		

5. How does the library handle a situation in which a selection is deemed not fit, in some sense, to order?

Negotiation - 10

Rarely happens - 2

Who makes this kind of decision? For serials, monographs?

	Serials	Monographs
Librarian	8	7
Associate/Assistant Librarian		1
Acquisitions Librarian	2	2

6. Is there anything in particular or in general about selection you would like to find out from a study such as this one?

EVALUATION

1. Has the collection ever been systematically evaluated? If so, how was it done? Describe the method.

Monographs[11]

Yes - 6	Reclass	4
	Books for College Libraries	2
	Choice	2
	Bibliographies	2
No - 4		

1. (Cont.)
Serials

Yes - 5

Use survey	2
Title-by-title review	2
Departmental review	1

No - 5

2. Did the evaluation produce useful results? Explain.

Yes - 6

3. Who managed the evaluation?

Librarian	4
Associate/Assistant Librarian	1
Acquisitions Librarian	1

4. If the collection has not been evaluated, are there plans to do so?

Yes - 3

No - 1

What method would be used?

RTSD guidelines

Who would manage it?

Librarian - 3

5. Does the library have any written guidelines for evaluation? If so, may I have a copy?

Yes[12] - 2

No - 8

6. Is there anything in particular or in general about evaluation you would like to find out from a study such as this one?

WEEDING

1. Has the collection ever been systematically weeded? Monographs, serials, both? If so, how was it done? Describe the method.

Monographs

Yes - 8		Reclass	5
		Faculty	2
		Faculty and Librarians	2
No - 2			

Serials

Yes - 2		Faculty and Librarians	1
		Storage	2
No - 8			

2. Who managed the weeding?

Librarian	5
Associate Assistant Librarian	2
Acquisitions Librarian	1

3. If the monograph collection has not been weeded, are there plans to do so? What method would be used? Who would manage it?

Yes - 1

No - 1

4. Does the library have any written guidelines for weeding? If so, may I have a copy?

Yes - 1

No - 9

5. Is there anything in particular or in general about weeding you would like to find out from a study such as this one?

ALLOCATION

1. How is the materials budget for the library decided?

The budgeting process is similar in almost all of the libraries surveyed. After discussion within the library, the librarian submits a budget request to his superior, e.g., dean of the faculty, academic vice-president or president. In several instances, this request is filtered through a library committee. The request is then finalized by an executive group within the college, reviewed by the trustees and returned to the librarian.

2. Is the budget usually adequate?

Yes - 9

No - 1

3. How is the library's materials budget allocated? E.g., by department, subject, other?

Department[13]	9
Subject	1
Other[14]	1

4. Who does the allocating?

Librarian	3
Librarian and Library Committee	3
Librarian and Acquisitions Librarian	2
Librarian and Associate/Assistant Librarian	1
Associate/Assistant Librarian	1

5. What method is used to allocate? E.g., model, percentage, historical, other?

In effect, all libraries were allocating by a combination of history and percentage. None were allocating by model or formula.

6. Is the library having problems with the percentage of the allocated to serials, to monographs?

Yes[15] - 2

No - 6

Beginning - 2

7. For this library, what percentage of the materials budget, ideally, should be spent for serials _____? For monographs _____? What percent is spent for serials _____? For monographs _____?

Serials - monograph budget ratio[16]

	should be	is
30-70	1	
35-65		1
40-60	3	2

7. (cont.)

Serials - monograph budget ratio

	should be	is
45-55	3	2
50-50	3	5
55-45		
60-40		
65-35		
70-30		

8. Is there anything in particular or in general about allocation you would like to find out from a study such as this one?

Please provide the following documents/information:

1. Latest HEGIS report.
2. Latest annual report.
3. Budget and allocation figures for the last five years.
4. Organization chart, if one exists.

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX II

[1] The library acts, in effect, only as a processing agent for faculty orders. Orders are not reviewed from a collection development point of view.

[2] Both implies a cooperative effort.

[3] Usually the librarian.

[4] This usually indicates that faculty spend individually off of a department allocation with little or no review.

[5] Librarians with selection responsibilities. The range here is great, from library selection committees with several thousand dollars to spend because the majority of the materials funds are allocated to faculty departments to librarians spending off of various subject allocations.

[6] Often, the librarian personally reviews all requests for serials continautions. In several cases the serials budget is also allocated to departments, and thus, the departments themselves unilaterally decide what titles they wish the library to purchase.

[7] Usually an enhancement factor.

[8] The library appears to use no normally kept records or files to help in collection development.

[9] Some version of it. Most of those interviewed thought that much of what was selected for the library was never used.

[10] Some version of it. Most of those interviewed thought that a small number of serial titles satisfied a large number of the demands and much of what was in the collection was never used.

11

Several libraries evaluated the monograph collection as it was being reclassified from Dewey to LC. The RTSD guidelines for evaluation were mentioned as being valuable aids for evaluating both the monographic and serial collections.

12

Several libraries used the RTSD guidelines and substituted them for any locally written guidelines.

13

If the budget is allocated by department, normally a percentage is left over for the library. This latter, and only this latter, is then usually spent by librarians, sometimes in concert and sometimes individually. The percentage allocated to departments varied from 0 to more than 80, with most libraries allocating more than 50 percent directly to departments.

14

One library has only two large funds, monographs and serials, against which expenditures are charged.

15

Most were concerned about the percentage of the materials budget spent for serials, though most felt they were not yet in trouble. Some were spending too much already, and others were beginning to see difficulties down the road in a year or two.

16

In the above ratios, the first number is for serials. Most felt comfortable about where they were at the moment.